

Customer No. 27061
Confirmation No. 9840

Patent
Attorney Docket No. GEMS8081.208

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of : Shillinglaw et al.
Serial No. : 10/749,452
Filed : December 31, 2003
For : Method and System for Dynamically Analyzing Consumer Feedback
to Determine Project Performance
Group Art No. : 3628
Examiner : Igor N. Borissov

CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a) and 1.10

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

Mailing

☐ deposited with the US Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

37 CFR 1.8(a)

37 CFR 1.10

☐ with sufficient postage as first class mail ☐ As "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label No.

Transmission

☐ transmitted by facsimile to Fax No.: 571-273-8300 addressed to Examiner Igor N. Borissov at the Patent and Trademark Office.
☒ transmitted by EFS-WEB addressed to Examiner Igor N. Borissov at the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: September 20, 2007

/Robyn L. Templin/
Signature

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §§1.191 AND 1.192

Dear Sir:

This Appeal Brief is being filed in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed with the Board of Patent Appeals on July 5, 2007.

1. **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is General Electric Company, the assignee of the above-referenced application by virtue of the Assignment recorded on March 2, 2004 at reel 014382, frame 0155.

2. **RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellant is unaware of any other appeals or interferences related to this Appeal. The undersigned is Appellant's legal representative in this Appeal. General Electric Company, the Assignee of the above-referenced application, as evidenced by the documents mentioned above, will be directly affected by the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

3. **STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 24-43 are currently pending, and claims 24-43 are currently under final rejection and, thus, are the subject of this appeal.

4. **STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

Appellant has not submitted any amendments subsequent to the Final Office Action mailed on April 4, 2007.

5. **SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Claim 24 sets forth a method of dynamically monitoring external responses to an implemented business plan that includes the steps of providing a feedback inputting graphical user interface (GUI) (10) to users of a newly integrated business unit and receiving a plurality of user feedback from individuals associated with the newly integrated business unit on an implemented business plan that integrates the newly integrated business unit within a business enterprise. The method further includes the steps of routing the plurality of user feedback to a centralized facility determining feedback characteristics of the plurality of user feedback at the centralized facility, and displaying, in near real-time, the feedback characteristics on an internal business plan GUI. Application, ¶11.

A computerized system (510) for dynamically determining user response to an implemented business integration is set forth in claim 31. The system (510) includes a computerized network (114, 115), a readable memory (513) electronically linked to the network, and a plurality of computers (512, 518, 522) connected to the network, wherein at least one of the plurality of computers displays electronic data to a user in the form of a GUI (558). The computers include a processing unit (516) programmed to display an external GUI (558) having at least one user response link accessible by users associated with an implemented business plan

that integrates a business unit within a parent company and display, upon user selection of the at least one user response link, at least one response GUI including a user survey GUI. The processing unit (516) is further programmed to receive user responses regarding the implemented business plan, automatically compile a response summary of user responses, and display at least the response summary on a summary GUI for the implemented business plan that is at least accessible by business personnel of the parent company. Application, ¶12.

In claim 39, a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave and representing a sequence of instructions is set forth. When executed by one or more computers (512, 518, 522), the computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave causes the one or more computers to display a first GUI (600) having at least two hyperlinks (632, 52) thereon, with one of the hyperlinks configured to display a second GUI (638) upon a user selection thereof and another hyperlink configured to display a third GUI (686) upon user selection thereof. The second GUI (638) enables a user to input feedback regarding an impact of an implemented business integration upon the user and the third GUI (686) enables the user to request a response to the feedback. The computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave further causes the computers (512, 518, 522) to route the feedback and the request for a response, if any, to a business integration leader, display at a least a summary of the feedback on a business integration graphical dashboard and, upon approval by the business integration leader, provide a summary GUI accessible on-demand by internal business personnel. Application, ¶13.

6. **GROUND OF REJECTION**

Whether claims 39-43 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Whether claims 24-35 and 37-43 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Oyagi et al. (USP 6,199,193). Whether claim 36 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Oyagi et al. in view of Eringis et al. (US Pub. 2003/0202638).

7. **ARGUMENTS**

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 39-43

With regard to the rejection of claims 39-43 under 35 U.S.C. §101, the Examiner stated that “claim 39 is directed to non-statutory subject matter because a ‘signal’ is not considered statutory.” *Final Office Action*, April 4, 2007, p. 2. The Examiner further asserted that “[a] carrier wave is not a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter” and that “[t]herefore, the claim is directed to non-statutory subject matter and is not considered statutory.”

Id. at 6. The Examiner, however, did not cite any evidence or support for this position. The MPEP fails to state that a claim directed to a signal is not statutory or not eligible for patent rights. Rather, MPEP §2106 states that “[t]he subject matter courts have found to be outside of, or exceptions to, the four statutory categories of invention is limited to abstract ideas, laws of nature and natural phenomena.” Clearly, a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave, as called for in claim 39, is not an abstract idea, law of nature, or natural phenomenon. MPEP §2106 further states that “[t]he burden is on the USPTO to set forth a *prima facie* case of unpatentability.” The Examiner has not satisfied this burden. The acts called for in claim 39 are directed to a computer data signal that represents a sequence of instructions that, when executed by one or more computers, cause the one or more computers to perform produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. As such, Applicant believes that claims 39-43 are directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39-43 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Oyagi et al.

Claim 24-30

The Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oyagi et al. Initially, Appellant would like to address the Examiner’s failure to give patentable weight to certain elements called for in claim 24. Specifically, claim 24 calls for, in part, a method of dynamically monitoring external responses to an implemented business plan that includes the steps of providing a feedback inputting graphical user interface (GUI) to users of a newly integrated business unit and receiving a plurality of user feedback from individuals associated with the newly integrated business unit on an implemented business plan that integrates the newly integrated business unit within a business enterprise.

In regards to the failure of Oyagi et al. to teach these elements called for in claim 24, the Examiner stated that Oyagi et al. “does not explicitly teach that said users include *users of a newly integrated business unit*” and “does not explicitly teach that said business plan *integrates the newly integrated business unit within a business enterprise.*” *Office Action*, supra at 3-4. Applicant agrees. The Examiner then stated that “[h]owever, the fact that whether said users include *users of a newly integrated business unit*, or not, cannot affect the method steps recited.” *Id.* The Examiner also stated that “[h]owever, the fact that whether said business plan *integrates the newly integrated business unit within a business enterprise*, or not, cannot affect the method

steps recited.” *Id.* The Examiner asserted that “information as to that said users include *users of a newly integrated business unit* is non-functional language and given no patentable weight” and that “information as to that said business plan *integrates the newly integrates* [sic] *business unit within a business enterprise*, and that the business plan *is an implemented business plan*, is non-functional language and given no patentable weight.” *Id.* Applicant respectfully disagrees that such information is non-functional language that should be given no patentable weight.

In asserting the above, the Examiner cited MPEP §2106(II)(C), which states that “[l]anguage that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation.” *See Office Action*, supra at 4. (emphasis added) However, claim 24, does not call for providing a feedback inputting graphical user interface optionally to users of a newly integrated business unit. Claim 24 also does not call for receiving a plurality of user feedback from individuals associated with the newly integrated business unit on a business plan, optionally implemented, that optionally integrates the newly integrated business unit within a business enterprise. Instead, such limitations are not optional and must be given patentable weight.

Furthermore, MPEP §2106.01 states that “[n]onfunctional descriptive material’ includes but is not limited to music, literary works, and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.” The subject matter identified by the Examiner in claim 24 as allegedly being non-functional language does not fit that described by the MPEP as being nonfunctional descriptive material. While the nonfunctional descriptive material listed in the MPEP is not limited to that material listed, Applicant believes that the Examiner has not satisfied the burden to show that the subject matter of claims 24 contains nonfunctional descriptive material.

In addition to failing to give patentable weight to all the elements of the pending claims, the Examiner has also failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 24 under §103(a). Appellant believes that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and one cannot be made based on the art of record. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. MPEP §2143. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success and both the reasonable expectation of success

and the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. Id., citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP §2143. Appellant believes that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be made based on the art of record because, as will be shown below, all the elements of claim 24 are not taught or suggested in Oyagi et al. and the Examiner has shown no suggestion or motivation to modify the cited reference to teach that which is called for in claim 24.

Oyagi et al. teaches “[a] software design evaluation server that facilitates end-user participation in a software development process so as to prevent any defects in functional specifications from remaining unsolved in the final version of the application that is developed.” *Oyagi et al.*, Abstract. The software design tool taught by Oyagi et al. allows a user to provide feedback (i.e. comments and suggested changes) regarding a prototype of an under-development (i.e. non-implemented) software program or application. The user feedback may then be routed to software engineers for consideration and/or implementation into a final version of the software. *See Oyagi et al.*, Abstract.

Specifically, the reference teaches the display of a series of prototype screens, which may be presented to a user along with a space for comments and suggestions. *Oyagi et al.*, Col. 5, lns. 11-12. The prototype screens may then be reviewed by a user and comments and/or suggestions may be provided in the given space. *Oyagi et al.*, Col. 5, lns. 13-14. The user feedback is then transmitted to a software design evaluation server for forwarding to development engineers. Specifically, “[t]he user’s comments and suggestions about the prototype screen are returned to the user feedback distribution unit 13 through a chat messaging service over the network 30, and the user feedback distribution unit 13 directly forwards them to the relevant development engineer.” *Oyagi et al.*, Col. 5, lns. 43-48. The software development or engineer may then review the comments and suggestions made regarding the prototype software and implement and/or consider the user feedback when developing a final version of the software application.

In contrast, the present invention, as defined by claim 24, is directed to a method of dynamically monitoring external responses to a business plan. The method or process includes providing a feedback inputting graphical user interface (GUI) and receiving external user feedback on an implemented business plan. The process then routes the external user feedback to

a centralized facility whereupon feedback characteristics regarding the implemented business plan are determined. The feedback characteristics may then be displayed, in near realtime, on an internal business plan GUI. A number of distinctions may be made between the claimed invention and that taught and/or suggested by Oyagi et al.

For example, the method called for in claim 24 is directed to, and positively calls for, user feedback regarding an implemented business plan. One skilled in the art will readily recognize that an implemented business plan, by definition, is substantially and significantly different from a prototype version of a software application such as that described by Oyagi et al. That is, one skilled in the art will readily recognize that an “implemented” business plan, by definition, is a business plan that has been set into motion or operation. Oyagi et al., on the other hand, specifically identifies its invention as relating to a prototypical software program. The reference further teaches the acquisition and processing of feedback relating to a prototypical software application such that user feedback may be considered when developing a final software program. Moreover, any conclusion that the reference’s teaching of a “prototype” software program as tantamount or equivalent to a “finalized” or implemented software program is contrary to the specific teachings of the reference. Specifically, Oyagi et al. defines the term “prototype” as “a software program (or application) at any development stage.” *Oyagi et al.*, Col. 4, lns. 59-61. One skilled in the art will readily recognize that the term “development” implies that developing of the software program is ongoing. That is, when the software program is “implemented” the development stage is complete. Therefore, one skilled in the art reading Oyagi et al. would not be motivated to implement the system of Oyagi et al. for dynamically monitoring external responses to an implemented business plan. As such, with regard to claim 24, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met by the Examiner.

Claim 31

In rejecting claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oyagi et al., the Examiner applied the same arguments as those set forth above in regard to claim 24. That is, the Examiner again asserted that “information as to that said users include *users of a newly integrated business unit* is non-functional language and given no patentable weight” and that “information as to that said business plan *integrates the newly integrates* [sic] *business unit within a business enterprise*, and that the business plan *is an implemented* business plan, is non-functional language and given no patentable weight.” *Office Action*, supra at 3-4. Again, Applicant respectfully

disagrees that such information is non-functional language. That is, the above elements called for in claim 31 are not suggested or made optional but are required to be performed. Claim 31, does not call for optionally displaying an external GUI having at least one user response link accessible by users associated with an implemented business plan that integrates a business unit within a parent company. Claim 31 also does not call for optionally displaying a response summary on a summary GUI for the implemented business plan that is at least accessible by business personnel of the parent company. Instead, such limitations are not optional and must be given patentable weight.

The Examiner has also failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claim 31 under §103(a), as all the elements of claim 31 are not taught or suggested in the cited reference. Claim 31 calls for a computerized system for dynamically determining user response to an implemented business integration and includes the displaying of a summary GUI for an implemented business plan or integration that details a summary of user responses. That is, similar to claim 24, claim 31 is also directed to, and positively calls for, user feedback regarding an implemented business plan. One skilled in the art will readily recognize that an implemented business plan, by definition, is substantially and significantly different from a prototype version of a software application such as that described by Oyagi et al. That is, an “implemented” business plan, by definition, is a business plan that has been put into operation. Oyagi et al., on the other hand, specifically identifies its invention as relating to software program development at any development stage. Oyagi et al., Col. 4, lns. 59-61. Any conclusion that the reference’s teaching of a “prototype” software program is tantamount or equivalent to a “finalized” or implemented software program is contrary to the specific teachings of the reference. One skilled in the art will readily recognize that the term “development” implies that developing of the software program is ongoing, as opposed to an “implemented” software program, in which the development stage is complete. Therefore, one skilled in the art reading Oyagi et al. would not be motivated to implement the system of Oyagi et al. for dynamically monitoring external responses to an implemented business plan.

In addition to the above elements, claim 31 also calls for displaying at least the response summary on a summary GUI for the implemented business plan that is at least accessible by business personnel of the parent company. Oyagi et al. fails to teach displaying a summary of the feedback as called for in claim 31, but rather, teaches the forwarding of feedback to individual

engineers or software programmers. *Oyagi et al.*, Col. 6, lns. 33-38. As such, with regard to a claim 31, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met by the Examiner.

Claim 35

In rejecting claim 35, the Examiner failed to address the elements called for therein. That is, the Examiner provided no indication of where the cited reference may teach or suggest that which is particularly called for in claim 35. Claim 35 specifies that user responses are transmitted to an integration leader and that the response summary for an implemented business plan or integration that details a summary of user responses is only displayed in the summary GUI upon authorization by the integration leader. In this regard, the summary GUI for the implemented business integration is not displayed until authorization is provided by an integration leader. In contrast, the system disclosed by *Oyagi et al.* fails to teach or suggest such authorization by a supervisor or leader. Specifically, the reference teaches that “[a]fter this user authentication, it examines the user ID, reference number of the user feedback, screen ID, and item ID, in order to locate particular development engineers relating to the screen or items that were subjected to the prototype review.” *Oyagi et al.*, Col. 6, lns. 33-38. The reference continues, “The user feedback distribution unit 13 then distributes the user’s comments and suggestions to the engineers.” *Id.* Accordingly, the reference fails to teach or suggest that a leader or supervisor authorization is needed before the feedback is distributed to the several engineers and/or software designers.

Claim 39

The Examiner rejected claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oyagi et al.* First, and similar to that argued above with respect to claims 24 and 31, Appellant believes that the Examiner has failed to give patentable weight to each of the elements called for in claim 39, those elements being directed to an implemented business integration. Additionally, *Oyagi et al.* fails to teach or suggest that which is called for in claim 39. Claim 39 calls for a computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave and representing a sequence of instructions that when executed by one or more computers causes the one or more computers to display a first GUI having at least two hyperlinks thereon. One of the hyperlinks is configured to display a second GUI upon user selection thereof and another hyperlink is configured to display a third GUI upon user selection thereof. In contrast, *Oyagi et al.* specifically teaches a comment space inclusive prototype presentation unit 11 that provides a user with a comment space to provide written comments and/or suggestions. *Oyagi et al.*, Col. 4, lns. 36-43. The reference fails to

teach or suggest the implementation of hyperlinks or multiple GUIs for the composition of feedback. In fact, Oyagi et al. teaches away from hyperlinks or multiple GUIs with its implementation of a comment space directly on the GUI under review.

Additionally, claim 39 calls for the third GUI as being configured to enable a user to request a response to the feedback. The reference relied upon by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest providing a response to the user who provided the comments and/or suggestions. That is, the reference fails to teach a GUI allowing a user to request a response to the feedback provided. The reference, as noted above, simply teaches the routing of received feedback regarding a prototype software application to a number of software engineers or developers for consideration. Additionally, as noted above, the reference fails to teach displaying a summary of the feedback as called for in claim 39. The reference simply teaches the forwarding of feedback to software engineers or developers.

Furthermore, claim 39 specifies that user input feedback and a request for a response is routed to a business integration leader, and that provision of a summary GUI accessible on-demand by internal business personnel is dependent upon approval of the business integration leader. Similar to the argument set forth above for claim 35, Oyagi et al. simply does not teach or suggest such a system. Rather, the system disclosed by Oyagi et al. teaches that “[a]fter this user authentication, it examines the user ID, reference number of the user feedback, screen ID, and item ID, in order to locate particular development engineers relating to the screen or items that were subjected to the prototype review.” *Oyagi et al.*, Col. 6, lns. 33-38. The reference continues, “The user feedback distribution unit 13 then distributes the user’s comments and suggestions to the engineers.” *Id.* Accordingly, the reference fails to teach or suggest that a leader or supervisor authorization is needed before a summary GUI is provided

Also, it should be noted that claim 39 positively calls for the receipt of user feedback relating to an implemented business integration. As discussed with respect to claims 24 and 31, the reference fails to teach or suggest the receipt and processing of feedback regarding an implemented integration application, plan, or policy.

Claims 25, 32, 43

With regard to claim 25, 32, and 43, the Examiner stated that Oyagi “does not explicitly teach that said received responses include neutral responses and too-early-to-tell responses, and that the business plan is an implemented business plan.” *Office Action*, supra at 4. The Examiner then stated that “[h]owever, based on common sense, it is within [sic] ability of one having ordinary skill in the art to come up with variations of possible feedbacks.” *Id.*

The Examiner’s reliance on “common sense” is improper. MPEP §2144.03 states:

It is never appropriate to rely solely on “common knowledge” in the art without evidentiary support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection was based. *Zurko*, 258 F.3d at 1385, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 (“[T]he Board cannot simply reach conclusions based on its own understanding or experience—or on its assessment of what would be basic knowledge or common sense. Rather, the Board must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings.”).

Neither the Board nor the Examiner may rely on common sense without pointing to some concrete evidence in the record to support a finding. In this case, the Examiner has not pointed to any concrete evidence in the record to support the Examiner’s finding. Accordingly, the Examiner’s reliance on common knowledge is improper. As such, with regard to claims 25, 32, and 43, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met by the Examiner.

Claims 37 and 38

With regard to claims 37 and 38, the Examiner asserted that Oyagi fails to “specifically teach that said personal information includes a name, and address, a telephone, number, a county, a zip code, a region, and email address and a sales representation name.” *Office Action*, supra at 5. The Examiner then asserted that “based on common sense, it is within [sic] ability of one having ordinary skill in the art to come up with variations of personal information.” *Id.* As with the rejection of claims 25, 32, and 43, the Examiner has not pointed to any concrete evidence in the record to support the Examiner’s finding. Accordingly, the Examiner’s reliance on common knowledge is improper. As such, with regard to claims 37 and 38, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met by the Examiner.

8. **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner has provided no supportable position or evidence that claims 24-35 and 37-43 are not patentable. As argued above, (1) claims 39-43 are believed to be directed towards statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101, and (2) the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting claims 24-35 and 37-43 under §103(a), as Oyagi et al. fails to teach or suggest all the elements set forth in the present claims. Accordingly, Appellant believes claims 24-35 and 37-43 are patentably distinct thereover and respectfully requests that the Board find claims 24-35 and 37-43 patentable over the prior art of record, direct withdrawal of all outstanding rejections and direct the present application be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin R. Rosin/

Kevin R. Rosin
Registration No. 55,584
Phone 262-268-8100 ext. 15
krr@zpspatents.com

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent L. Baker/

Kent L. Baker
Registration No. 52,584
Phone 262-268-8100 ext. 12
klb@zpspatents.com

Dated: September 20, 2007
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.208

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
136 South Wisconsin Street
Port Washington, WI 53074
262-268-8100

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1-23. (Canceled)

24. (Previously Presented) A method of dynamically monitoring external responses to an implemented business plan comprising the steps of:

providing a feedback inputting graphical user interface (GUI) to users of a newly integrated business unit;

receiving a plurality of user feedback from individuals associated with the newly integrated business unit on an implemented business plan that integrates the newly integrated business unit within a business enterprise;

routing the plurality of user feedback to a centralized facility;

at the centralized facility, determining feedback characteristics of the plurality of user feedback; and

displaying, in near real-time, the feedback characteristics on an internal business plan GUI.

25. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 24 wherein the feedback characteristics include at least one of a positive response, a negative response, and a neutral response.

26. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 24 wherein the newly integrated business unit includes at least one of a newly acquired business unit, a new supplier, a business unit newly integrated within another business unit, a reorganization of an existing business unit, and a restructuring of a business unit.

27. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 24 further comprising the step of assigning at least one of a category, a region, a status, and an administrator to each user feedback.

28. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 27 further comprising the step of displaying, on the internal business plan GUI, at least one of the category, the region, a user response author, a text of each user response, and, if any, a reply to each user response.

29. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 24 wherein the internal business plan GUI is accessible via one of an intranet, Internet, and extranet and is only viewable by enterprise personnel.

30. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 24 further comprising the step of routing the user feedback to a business plan leader and displaying the feedback characteristics on the business plan GUI upon authorization of the business plan leader.

31. (Previously Presented) A computerized system for dynamically determining user response to an implemented business integration, the system comprising:

- a computerized network;

- a readable memory electronically linked to the network;

- a plurality of computers connected to the network wherein at least one of the plurality of computers display electronic data to a user in the form of a GUI and includes a processing unit programmed to:

- display an external GUI having at least one user response link accessible by users associated with an implemented business plan that integrates a business unit within a parent company;

- display, upon user selection of the at least one user response link, at least one response GUI including a user survey GUI;

- receive user responses regarding the implemented business plan;

- automatically compile a response summary of user responses; and

- display at least the response summary on a summary GUI for the implemented business plan that is at least accessible by business personnel of the parent company.

32. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 31 wherein the processing unit is further programmed to determine if each user response is one of:

- a very positive response;

- a positive response;

- a neutral/no change response;

- a negative response; and

- a too-early-to-tell response.

33. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 32 wherein the processing unit is further programmed to tally the user responses for each category and display the tally on the summary GUI.

34. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 31 wherein the processing unit is further programmed to display a region, a modality, and an author for each displayed user response in the response summary.

35. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 31 wherein the processing unit is further programmed to transmit the user responses to an integration leader and wherein the response summary is only displayed in the summary GUI upon authorization by the integration leader.

36. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 35 wherein the processing unit is further programmed to display a user drill-down menu to enable the integration leader to identify personnel roles in relation to the implemented business plan wherein the personnel roles are automatically linked to the implemented business plan.

37. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 31 wherein the processing unit is further programmed to display a personal information GUI, the personal information GUI configured to allow a user to input contact information including a name, an address, a telephone number, a country, a zip code, a region, an email address, a sales representation name, and a request for a reply.

38. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 37 wherein the processing unit is further programmed to transmit the request for a reply to an integration leader.

39. (Previously Presented) A computer data signal embodied in a carrier wave and representing a sequence of instructions that when executed by one or more computers causes the one or more computers to:

display a first GUI having at least two hyperlinks thereon, one of the hyperlinks configured to display a second GUI upon a user selection thereof and another hyperlink configured to display a third GUI upon user selection thereof;

wherein the second GUI enables a user to input feedback regarding an impact of an implemented business integration upon the user;

wherein the third GUI enables the user to request a response to the feedback;

route the feedback and the request for a response, if any, to a business integration leader;

display at a least a summary of the feedback on a business integration graphical dashboard; and

upon approval by the business integration leader, provide a summary GUI accessible on-demand by internal business personnel.

40. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal of claim 39 wherein the sequence of instructions when executed further causes the one or more computers to continuously update the summary GUI with user input feedback.

41. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal of claim 39 wherein the sequence of instructions when executed further causes the one or more computers to display selected user feedback on the summary GUI.

42. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal of claim 41 wherein the sequence of instructions when executed further causes the one or more computers to display a category, a pole, an author, an inquiry, if any, and an authorized response, if any, for each selected and displayed user feedback.

43. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal of claim 39 wherein the sequence of instructions when executed further causes the one or more computers to determine a total number of positive user responses, a total number of neutral user responses, and a total number of negative user responses and display the totals on the summary GUI.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

-- None --

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

-- None --